Project Charter

Project Name: Clean Boats Clean Waters Clean Grants

Lakes/River Management Coordinator

Team Goal/Mission:

The Clean Boats Clean Waters Clean Grants (CBCWCG) goal is to reduce the staff and volunteer time spent processing Aquatic Invasive Species Education, Prevention, and Planning (AEPP) grants for watercraft inspection projects.

Volunteers and staff perceive the existing AEPP grant application, reporting, and reimbursement process for watercraft inspection projects to be overly burdensome, particularly since DNR grants fund an estimated 95% of these types of projects. The projects involve establishing Clean Boats Clean Waters watercraft inspection programs at boat landings throughout the state. Volunteer and paid watercraft inspectors then educate boaters about AIS and teach them how to make sure their boats, trailers, and other equipment are AIS-free. Grant sponsors believe their time is better spent implementing these projects than on the administrative activities like grant applications and reporting. Surveys show that the number one way to learn about AIS is from a watercraft inspector. Furthermore, there is survey evidence that these programs have slowed the spread. Unfortunately, volunteer burnout is prevalent, and some local communities may not even pursue grant funding because of the application process itself. We believe this CBCWCG project will reduce the grant process burden, and may also increase the number of boat landings with watercraft inspection programs, thus further slowing the spread of AIS in Wisconsin.

The team will implement improvements that accomplish the following:

- 1. Reduce DNR staff time spent counseling applicants on and reviewing grant applications, sponsor match documentation, final project reports, and approving reimbursement requests.
- 2. Reduce the amount of time AEPP grantees spend developing grant applications, documenting volunteer labor for grant match purposes, writing final project reports and compiling reimbursement requests.
- 3. Improve customer satisfaction.
- 4. Simplify the grant application, reporting, and reimbursement process.

Measure(s) to be used to determine success:

- 1. DNR staff time spent reviewing applications, final report materials and approving reimbursement requests will be reduced 30%.
- 2. Grantee time spent developing applications, documenting volunteer labor for grant match purposes, and developing final reports and reimbursement requests will be reduced 50%.
- 3. Customer satisfaction will be determined by survey questions incorporated into the reimbursement request form.
- 4. Decrease the steps in the process to receive grant funding for a watercraft inspection project by 50%.

Team Members*:

The Team consists of DNR staff and AEPP grantees and other interested parties. Some Team members met during Fall 2011, and the expanded Team described below met in December 2011 and February and March 2012. A smaller Sub-team will examine current grant administrative requirements, redundancies, and the amount of time spent by volunteers and DNR Grants and Lakes staff to develop grant applications, document contributions that are used as match, and develop final project reports for AIS grants used in support of the State's Clean Boats Clean Waters program.

Jane Malischke, CFA Bureau, co-chair Pamela Toshner, Watershed Mgmt Bureau, co-chair John Haack, UW-Extension Natural Resources Educator (facilitator) Carroll Schaal, DNR Lakes Team Leader Kathy Hanson, DNR Grants Team Leader Bob Wakeman, DNR Aquatic Invasive Species Coordinator John Gozdzialski, DNR Northern Region Director Roger Wilson & Jim Heim, Douglas Co Association of Lakes & Streams
Ted Ritter, Vilas County Invasive Species Coordinator
Ed Harvey, Conservation Congress
Earl Cook, Washburn Co Lakes & River Association & Wisconsin Lakes
* The Lean Project Team will not necessarily include all of the people listed above.

Issues to be addressed:

Successful project sponsors who receive grant funding from the AIS AEPP grant program are allowed to use volunteer time as sponsor match to grant funds they receive. Volunteers are primarily stationed at boat launch ramps and other public access points within the jurisdiction of the project sponsor to educate boaters about the importance of cleaning their boats to prevent transport of AIS from one waterbody to another. Grant sponsors are often repeat customers and have extensive knowledge about AIS. There are areas in the grant application where the same information is requested more than once; this can be streamlined. Furthermore, required documentation for time spent implementing and reporting on the projects is also duplicative. Project sponsors submit the time reports and other documentation to CFA regional grants staff at the end of the project to justify project costs and in support of reimbursement requests. The sponsors are also required to enter their watercraft inspection data into the Surface Water Integrated Monitoring System.

The CBCW subprogram is a structured program described in ch, NR 198, Wis. Adm. Code, which requires the following: standardized training for boat landing inspectors; minimum 200 hours per boat launch for a grant-funded inspection project; volunteer labor credited at \$12/hour; a reporting requirement that inspection data be entered in SWIMS; a maximum cost-share percentage of 75%; and a maximum grant award of \$4,000 per boat landing per year. The vast majority of these types of AEPP grant applications get funded so there is an opportunity to make the application process less cumbersome on local communities and volunteers who can spend the saved time actively helping protect our lakes.

Expected Results:

The CBCWCG project will utilize the existing Code requirements to create a framework for streamlining AIS grant processes, including application, reporting, and reimbursement.

We expect this Project will make it much easier for interested communities, including qualified lake associations, non-profit government organizations, and municipalities to access grant funds to help protect Wisconsin lakes from AIS and contain AIS those lakes that already have them. Thus, we anticipate the Clean Boats Clean Waters demand will exceed the supply of funding in short order. The following two future phases will address the increased demand:

Phase 2: Develop priority funding process for Clean Boats Clean Waters Clean Grants.

Phase 3: Seek legislative approval to increase funding for watercraft inspection and/or to allow DNR to use AIS grant funds to directly contract for watercraft inspection projects.

Support/Resource People:

Any interim products developed by the Team should be reviewed by DNR Legal Counsel for appropriateness and compliance with statutes and administrative codes before final recommendation by the group. Final recommendations will need to be incorporated into the next AIS grant application form and instructions as well as the Financial Guidelines booklet issued to AIS grantees; CFA Central Office support staff will be responsible for these changes.

Responsibilities and Boundaries:

The Team will focus on streamlining administrative processes related to watercraft inspection (i.e. Clean Boats Clean Waters) projects that are funded with AIS AEPP grants.

Project Name: Clean Boats Clean Waters Clean Grants

Project Team Leader: Jane Malischke & Pamela Toshner

Project Purpose: The Clean Boats Clean Waters Clean Grants (CBCWCG) goal is to reduce the staff and volunteer time spent processing Aquatic Invasive Species Education, Prevention, and Planning (AEPP) grants for watercraft inspection projects.

Project Team Members: Roger Wilson & Jim Heim, Douglas County Association of Lakes & Streams; Earl Cook, Washburn County Lakes & Streams and Wisconsin Lakes; Kathy Hanson, Carroll Schaal, Bob Wakeman, and John Gozdzialski, DNR; Ted Ritter, Vilas County; Ed Harvey, Conservation Congress; John Haack, UW-Extension.

Summary of Improvements: See attached Project Implementation Plan

Project Results:

1 Toject Results.				
Goal	Baseline	Target	After Improvements	Goal Met?
		O	Improvements	Wict.
Reduce DNR staff workload.	18 hrs/proj	(30% reduction)		
		12 hrs/proj		
Reduce Lead (delivery time).	90 days	(40% reduction)		
		20 days		
		(i.e. 14 business days)		
Improve Customer	Dissatisfaction	Existing customers	Survey of previous	
Satisfaction.	expressed via verbal	support change by	grant sponsors who	
Sansiaction.	and written feedback	100%	participate in new	
			process is	
			anticipated in 2013	
Simplify the Process.	15+ steps	(50% reduction)		
-		8 steps		
Ensure Staff and Customer				
Safety.				

Project Cost:

Troject Cost.				
	Hours	Dollars		
Project Team Leaders*	(JM 155) (PT 141.5)			
Project Team Members**	110			
Meeting Costs		\$ 84.00		
Improvement Costs		\$ undefinedstaff time		
Total		\$		

^{*}Includes estimated time related to project from fall 2011 through 08/10/2012.

^{**} Includes DNR, UW-Ext, and citizen team members (i.e. original AIS Work Group team and DNR Team).



Recommendations for Future Code/Statute Changes: See attached Opportunity Chart

Lessons Learned: (Pamela Toshner)

- * Lean Six Sigma works, particularly when supported by our leadership and linked to performance objectives. We internally discussed and the public has been asking for streamlined watercraft inspection grants, for example, for over 5 years. We've now been able to make it happen in less than one year!
- * If the project affects multiple divisions, all those DAs should be in the loop and tied to its completion. This is particularly important so middle managers know what's happening/coming for their staff.
- * Our original Team (i.e. AIS Work Group) was formed more for political reasons, but I think they were beneficial since they were customers who were keenly aware of the challenges. Sometimes it was a little tough to bridge back to our internal DNR team, though. In the future, I'd have the right people on the right team at the right time. The reason we didn't is because the AIS Work Group formed before Lean Government was on the DNR's radar.
- * I enjoyed the project and seeing peoples' keen interest in making it happen. The response and trust among colleagues and the public were strong. My sense is we as field staff had credibility because we do these projects on a daily basis. I would encourage more field-based team leaders and projects to build trust in and for the DNR. This is particularly true if field staff will be responsible for implementation.
- * The flip-side of field-based team leaders and projects is that we don't have the authority to make the suggested/final changes. The decision-making authority, roles and responsibilities, and communication approach should be defined early-on.
- * CAES Division leadership and communication impressed me. Thanks to them for supporting the project from the get-go and putting so much trust in Jane and me.

(Jane Malischke)

- Ditto to Pamela's comments above.
- O The format established to keep the projects moving and provide opportunities for discussion/assistance was essential to keep the projects moving and to ensure their successes. Having an established schedule; structured check in periods; scheduled opportunities to discuss questions w/ Britt & Kristy...helped keep us focused.

Thanks and Kudos to Kristy for so positively taking on this challenge!